arXiv:1403.1922v1 [stat.ME] 8 Mar 2014

Adaptive Sparse Reduced-rank Regression

Zongming Ma* and Tingni Sun†

Department of Statistics
University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

This paper studies the problem of estimating a large coefficient matrix in a multiple response linear regression model when the coefficient matrix is both sparse and of low rank. We are especially interested in the high dimensional settings where the number of predictors and/or response variables can be much larger than the number of observations. We propose a new estimation scheme, which achieves competitive numerical performance while significantly reducing computation time when compared with state-of-the-art methods. Moreover, we show the proposed estimator achieves near optimal non-asymptotic minimax rates of estimation under a collection of squared Schatten norm losses simultaneously by providing both the error bounds for the estimator and minimax lower bounds. In particular, such optimality results hold in the high dimensional settings.

Keywords: Adaptive estimation, Dimension reduction, Group sparsity, High dimensionality, Minimax rates, Low rank matrices, Variable selection.

1 Introduction

High dimensional sparse linear regression has been the central topic of recent development in high dimensional statistical inference. When the response is univariate, researchers have developed a dazzling collection of tools to take advantage of potential sparsity in the regression coefficients, e.g., Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996; Chen et al., 1998), SCAD (Fan and Li, 2001), Dantzig selector (Candes and Tao, 2007), MCP (Zhang, 2010a), etc.

In contemporary applications, we routinely face multivariate or even high dimensional response variables together with a large number of predictors, while the sample size can be much smaller. For example, in a cognitive neuroscience study, Vounou et al. (2012) used around ten thousand voxels from fMRI imaging as the response variables for each subject, over four hundred thousand SNPs (single-nucleotide polymorphisms) as predictors. In comparison, the sample size is just several hundred. Let n denote the sample size, m the number of responses, and p the number of predictors. We observe a pair of matrices (Y, X) from the following linear model:

$$Y = XA + Z, \tag{1}$$

where Y is an $n \times m$ response matrix, X is an $n \times p$ design matrix, A is a $p \times m$ coefficient matrix that we are interested in, and Z is an unobserved $n \times m$ matrix with i.i.d. noise entries. Thus, the

*Email: zongming@wharton.upenn.edu. The research of Zongming Ma is supported in part by the Claude Marion Endowed Faculty Scholar Award of the Wharton School.

†Email: tingni@wharton.upenn.edu.

i^{th} rows of Y and X collect the measurements of the response and the predictor variables on the i^{th} subject. Similar to the univariate response case, when either the number of predictors p or the number of response variables m is large, it is hard to estimate the coefficient matrix A accurately unless its intrinsic dimension is low.

In the literature, researchers have considered two important types of structural assumptions that induce low intrinsic dimension of A. The first is *low-rankness* where the rank of A is assumed to be much smaller than its matrix dimensions p and n. This structure has been referred to as reduced-rank regression and has been widely used in econometrics. See, for instance, Izenman (1975), Reinsel and Velu (1998) and the references therein. The other is *sparsity* where only a small subset of size s out of the p predictors contribute to the variation of Y. In other words, only s out of the p rows in A are non-zero. Structures of this kind arise naturally in the context of multi-task learning (Koltchinskii et al., 2011). It can also be viewed as a leading example of *group sparsity* (Yuan and Lin, 2006), where the rows of A form natural groups. For either structure, researchers have obtained good understanding on how the optimal statistical estimation depends on the model parameters and on how to achieve optimal estimation without the knowledge of the rank r or the sparsity level s. See, for instance, Bunea et al. (2011) for the low rank case, and Huang and Zhang (2010) and Lounici et al. (2011) for the group sparse case.

In this paper, we are interested in the situation where both low-rankness and sparsity are present in the coefficient matrix. In what follows, we shall call model (1) the *sparse reduced-rank regression* model when A possesses both structures. Under this model, our goal is two-folded:

(1) We want to understand how the optimal estimation error depends on both the rank and the sparsity parameters;

(2) We want to construct a computationally efficient estimation procedure which can achieve near optimal estimation errors adaptively.

The interest in sparse reduced-rank regression comes from both theory and applications, and has risen significantly in recent years.

In applications such as cancer genomics and neurosciences, researchers can now measure a lot of response and predictor variables and so the size of the coefficient matrix is ever increasing. Thus, imposing both structures leads to enhanced interpretability and hence can be more attractive than simply imposing one type of structure. For example, in the aforementioned cognitive neuroscience study (Vounou et al., 2012), the authors constrained the rank of the coefficient matrix to be three and identified a small number of SNPs as significant predictors based on cross-validation and stability selection (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2010). See also Vounou et al. (2010).

From a theoretical point of view, computationally efficient adaptive estimation of the coefficient matrix has not been thoroughly understood for this model, especially in the high dimensional regime. Chen and Huang (2012) proposed a weighted rank-constrained group Lasso approach with two heuristic numerical algorithms and studied its large sample asymptotics. Under a slightly more general model, Chen et al. (2012) proposed a similar non-convex penalized least squares approach and also studied its large sample asymptotics. However, neither paper provides any guarantee on the performance of their procedures when the number of predictors exceeds the sample size. In the high dimensional regime, Bunea et al. (2012) derived oracle inequalities and studied the minimax rates under squared prediction error loss for this model. However, the estimator which was shown to attain the near optimal rates adaptively is the global solution of a non-convex rank-constrained group Lasso problem and hence is computationally intractable. On the other hand, there is no theoretical justification for the companioning heuristic algorithm which has nice numerical performance.

The main contribution of the current paper is two-folded. First, we propose a new computationally efficient estimator for the coefficient matrix in (1) whose numerical performance matches that of the state-of-the-art approaches in Bunea et al. (2012) and Chen and Huang (2012) while the computational cost can be reduced significantly by up to nearly 85%. Moreover, we determine minimax estimation rates of the coefficient matrix with respect to a large class of squared Schatten norm losses and show that our estimator can achieve the near optimal rates adaptively for this large collection of loss functions simultaneously. These minimax rates, except for the special case of squared error loss, are new.

The rest of the paper is organized as the following. In Section 2, we present our new methodology for obtaining simultaneously sparse and low rank estimators of the coefficient matrix. Its competitive numerical performance is demonstrated in Section 3 through both simulation and real data examples. In Section 4, we provide finite sample upper bounds for the proposed estimator with respect to a collection of squared Schatten norm losses. In addition, we derive matching lower bounds and hence show that the proposed estimator is simultaneously adaptive and optimal with respect to all the loss functions under consideration. The proofs are presented in Section 5. An implementation of the proposed estimator together with the code for reproducing the simulation studies is available at http://www-stat.wharton.upenn.edu/~zongming/software/SARRScode.zip.

Notation For any $n \times p$ matrix $X = (x_{ij})$, the i^{th} row of X is denoted by X_{i*} and the j^{th} column by X_{*j}. For a positive integer k, $[k]$ denotes the index set $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$. For any set I, $|I|$ denotes its cardinality and I^{c} its complement. For two subsets I and J of indices, we write X_{IJ} for the $|I| \times |J|$ submatrices formed by x_{ij} with $(i, j) \in I \times J$. When I or J is the whole set, we abbreviate it with a $*$, and so if $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, then $X_{I*} = X_{I[p]}$ and $X_{*J} = X_{[n]J}$. We denote the rank of X by $\mathsf{rank}(X)$, and $\sigma_i(X)$ stands for its i^{th} largest singular value. For any $q \in [1, \infty)$, the Schatten-q norm of X is

$$\|X\|_{\text{S}_q} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n \wedge p} \sigma_i^q(X) \right)^{1/q},$$

and for $q = \infty$, $\|X\|_{\text{S}_\infty} = \sigma_1(X)$. Note that $\|X\|_{\text{S}_2} = \|X\|_{\text{F}}$ is the Frobenius norm and $\|X\|_{\text{S}_\infty} = \|X\|_{\text{op}}$ is the operator norm of X. For any vector a, $\|a\|$ denotes its ℓ_2 norm. The ℓ_2/ℓ_1 norm of X is defined as the ℓ_1 norm of the vector consisting of its row ℓ_2 norms: $\|X\|_{2,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|X_{j*}\|$. If $n \geq p$ and X has orthonormal columns, then we say X is an orthonormal matrix, and we write $X \in O(n, p)$. We use $\mathbf{1}_d$ to denote the all-one vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For any real number a and b, set $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$, $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ and $a_+ = a \vee 0$.

2 Methodology

In this section, we propose a new estimation scheme for the coefficient matrix A in sparse reduced-rank multivariate regression, where both dimension reduction and variable selection are taken into account.

2.1 Main Algorithm

We first introduce our main algorithm, which is summarized as Algorithm 1. In what follows, we explain the motivation for the algorithm. To start the algorithm, we need the (estimated) rank r of the coefficient matrix, an initial orthonormal matrix $V_{(0)} \in O(m, r)$, and a penalty function $\rho(\cdot; \lambda)$ used in group penalized regression. We require the penalty function to depend on its first

matrix argument only through its row norms. Moreover, we require that the penalty function is non-decreasing when any row norm of the matrix increases. The choice of the penalty function and initialization will be discussed in detail in Sections 2.2 and 2.3.

The algorithm is based on the following observation: If we can first estimate the right singular subspace[1] of A sufficiently accurately, say by the column space of an orthonormal matrix $\widetilde{V} \in O(m, r)$, then we can estimate A by

$$\widehat{A} = \underset{T \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}}{\arg\min} \left\{ \|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XT\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(T; \lambda) \right\}. \tag{2}$$

Since $\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}'$ approximates the projection matrix onto the right singular subspace of A, we call this estimation approach *Subspace Assisted Regression with Row Sparsity* (SARRS). The objective function aims to strike the right bias–variance tradeoff, with the first term representing the variance part and the second term the bias part. The effect of post-multiplying Y by an approximate projection matrix onto the right singular subspace of A is essentially to restrict the variance calculation on this subspace, and hence incorporating dimension reduction with variable selection. Given X, Y and $\widetilde{V}$, we can solve (2) with the usual group penalized regression methods. Alternatively, we can further reduce the computation cost by first solving

$$\widetilde{B} = \underset{B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}}{\arg\min} \left\{ \|Y\widetilde{V} - XB\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(B; \lambda) \right\}, \tag{3}$$

and as we shall show later in Section 5.1, the desired estimator

$$\widehat{A} = \widetilde{B}\widetilde{V}'. \tag{4}$$

In view of the foregoing discussion, Algorithm 1 can be viewed as a two stage procedure. In the first stage (steps 1–3), we seek an accurate estimation of the right singular subspace of A. In the second stage (steps 4–5), we carry out the aforementioned procedure of estimating A after identifying its right singular subspace.

In what follows, we explain the first stage in more details. Note that the right singular subspace of A is identical to that that of XA. Therefore, we seek $\widetilde{V}$ by estimating the right singular vectors of XA in this stage.

In step 1, we first post-multiply the Y matrix by an initial orthonormal matrix $V_{(0)}$. Here, we only need the columns of $V_{(0)}$ to be non-orthogonal to the right singular space of A. Now we can think of X and $YV_{(0)}$ as following model (1) with coefficient matrix $AV_{(0)}$. Suppose $r = \mathsf{rank}(A)$, then $AV_{(0)}$ should ideally be of full column rank. On the other hand, if A has at most s non-zero rows, then so does $AV_{(0)}$. Since the rows of $AV_{(0)}$ form natural groups, we apply group penalized regression with design matrix X and response matrix $YV_{(0)}$ to estimate the coefficient matrix $AV_{(0)}$. In step 2, we compute the left singular vector matrix $U_{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ of $XB_{(1)}$. Note that $B_{(1)}$ is an estimator of $AV_{(0)}$. If $B_{(1)}$ were equal to $AV_{(0)}$, then the column subspace of $U_{(1)}$ would be exactly the left singular subspace of $XAV_{(0)}$, which in turn equals the left singular subspace of XA. Following this line of logic, $U_{(1)}U_{(1)}'$ would then be the projection matrix onto the left singular subspace of XA, and so the columns of $V_{(1)}$ would be good estimators of the right singular vectors of XA, the quantities that we desire. Hopefully, the columns of $V_{(1)}$ still estimate the right singular vectors of XA well when $B_{(1)}$ is not exactly but close to $AV_{(0)}$.

We remark that though group penalized regression is used in both steps 1 and 4 of the algorithm, they serve very different purposes. In step 1, it is essentially used to estimate the left singular subspace of XA, while in step 4, it serves as an intermediate step to compute the estimator $\widehat{A}$ in (2).

[1]The subspace spanned by the right singular vectors. The left singular subspace is defined analogously.

Algorithm 1: Subspace Assisted Regression with Row Sparsity (SARRS)

Input: Observed response matrix Y, design matrix X,
rank r, initial matrix $V_{(0)}$ and penalty function $\rho(\cdot;\lambda)$ with penalty level λ.

Output: Estimated coefficient matrix $\widehat{A}$.

1 Group penalized regression

$$B_{(1)} = \underset{B\in\mathbb{R}^{p\times r}}{\arg\min}\Big\{\|YV_{(0)} - XB\|_F^2/2 + \rho(B;\lambda)\Big\},$$

2 Compute the left singular vectors of $XB_{(1)}$, denoted by $U_{(1)}$.

3 Compute the right singular vectors of $U_{(1)}U_{(1)}'Y$, denoted by $V_{(1)}$.

4 Group penalized regression

$$B_{(2)} = \underset{B\in\mathbb{R}^{p\times r}}{\arg\min}\Big\{\|YV_{(1)} - XB\|_F^2/2 + \rho(B;\lambda)\Big\},$$

5 Compute the estimated coefficient matrix by $\widehat{A} = B_{(2)}V_{(1)}'$.

2.2 Group Penalized Regression

The penalized regression in steps 1 and 4 of Algorithm 1 can be viewed as a special case of linear regression with group sparsity, where each row of the coefficient matrix is considered as a group and all groups are of the same size r.

Penalized regression with group structure has been extensively studied. One of the most popular procedures is the group Lasso (Bakin, 1999; Yuan and Lin, 2006), where the penalty function is defined by the ℓ_2/ℓ_1 matrix norm as follows

$$\rho(B;\lambda) = \lambda\|B\|_{2,1} = \lambda\sum_{j=1}^{p}\|B_{j*}\|_2. \tag{5}$$

The theoretical properties of group Lasso have been studied in the literature, using ideas originating from the study of Lasso. Huang and Zhang (2010) showed the upper bounds for the estimation and prediction errors of the group Lasso with proper penalty level under strong group sparsity and group sparse eigenvalue conditions. Lounici et al. (2011) provided similar error bounds under a group version of the restricted eigenvalue condition.

In univariate response linear regression, concave penalties have been introduced as an alternative to the ℓ_1 penalty and have been shown to achieve comparable performances in prediction, estimation and selection. Huang et al. (2012) described the application of concave penalties to regression with group structure. The penalty function can be written in a more general form

$$\rho(B;\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^{p}\widetilde{\rho}(\|B_{j*}\|_2;\lambda). \tag{6}$$

In this formulation, the penalty function $\widetilde{\rho}$ can be SCAD (Fan and Li, 2001), MCP (Zhang, 2010a), capped-ℓ_1 (Zhang, 2010b), etc. Huang et al. (2012) proved that the global solution of the group MCP behaves like the oracle least squares estimator under sparse Riesz conditions (Zhang and Huang, 2008).

Algorithm 2: Initialization I: Taking advantage of low-rankness

Input: Response matrix Y, design matrix X, noise level σ and a threshold level η.

Output: Estimated rank $\widehat{r}$, initial matrix $V_{(0)}$.

1 Compute $P = XM^{-}X'$, where $M = X'X$ and M^{-} its Moore–Penrose pseudo-inverse.

2 Compute the singular values of PY and select

$$\widehat{r} = \max\{j : \sigma_j(PY) \geq \sigma\eta\}.$$

3 Compute the right singular vectors $V_{(0)} = (v_1^{(0)}, \ldots, v_{\widehat{r}}^{(0)})$, where $v_j^{(0)}$ is the jth right singular vector of PY.

Alternatively, we may apply the group square-root Lasso method (Bunea et al., 2013) in both stages. The group square-root Lasso method has been proved to achieve the same estimation and prediction accuracy as group Lasso while the selection of the optimal penalty level does not require estimation of the noise variance.

In Section 4, we will present a theoretically justified choice of the penalty level λ for penalty function (5) when we have i.i.d. normal noises. In practice, we can always select λ by cross validation with prediction error.

2.3 Initialization

We now discuss the initialization of Algorithm 1. Throughout, we assume the noise standard deviation σ is known. Otherwise, we can estimate it by

$$\widehat{\sigma} = \text{median}(\sigma(Y))/\sqrt{n \vee m}, \tag{7}$$

where $\sigma(Y)$ is the collection of all nonzero singular values of Y. The goal is to consistently select the rank r and an orthonormal matrix $V_{(0)}$ whose column vectors are non-orthogonal to the right singular subspace of A. To this end, we propose two possible ways to initialize, which are summarized in Algorithms 2 and 3. Following the proposal in Bunea et al. (2011), Algorithm 2 gives the initial values by taking advantage of the low rankness of XA. On the other hand, Algorithm 3 capitalizes on the row sparsity of A. The theoretical properties of the proposals will be studied later in Section 4. In practice, Algorithm 2 is most appropriate when the rank r is small, and Algorithm 3 most appropriate when the sparsity s and the number of responses m are small.

Remark 1. The theoretically justified choices for the user specified parameters in Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 will be presented in Section 4.2. For Algorithm 2, simulation results in Section 3 show that setting $\eta = \sqrt{2m} + \sqrt{2(n \wedge p)}$ as suggested by Bunea et al. (2012) works well for normal data. For Algorithm 3, we recommend setting $\lambda_0 = 4\sigma \max_j \|X_{*j}\|(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{4\log p})$ and $\eta = \sqrt{s_0(m + 4\log p)}$ for normal data, where $s_0 = |\text{supp}(A_{(0)})|$.

In practice, we may also select the rank based on cross validation. Suppose the data is split into training and testing samples. For any given value of $r \in [m \wedge p]$, we can carry out the $V_{(0)}$ calculation step in either initialization method and then run Algorithm 1 using only the training sample. The resulting $\widehat{A}$ is then used to calculate the prediction error on the testing sample. Thus, we can select the value of r that leads to the smallest prediction error on the testing sample, or the smallest average prediction error if k-fold cross validation is used. Since both initialization methods and Algorithm 1 are computationally efficient, such a cross validation approach is feasible.

Algorithm 3: Initialization II: Taking advantage of sparsity

Input: Response matrix Y, design matrix X, penalty level λ, noise level σ and a threshold level η.

Output: Estimated rank $\widehat{r}$, initial matrix $V_{(0)}$.

1 Compute an initial estimate of A by group Lasso

$$A_{(0)} = \underset{A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}}{\arg\min} \Big\{ \|Y - XA\|_F^2/2 + \lambda_0 \|A\|_{2,1} \Big\}.$$

2 Compute the singular values of $XA_{(0)}$ and select

$$\widehat{r} = \max\{j : \sigma_j(XA_{(0)}) \geq \sigma\eta\}.$$

3 Compute the right singular vectors $V_{(0)} = (v_1^{(0)}, \ldots, v_{\widehat{r}}^{(0)})$, where $v_j^{(0)}$ is the jth right singular vector of $XA_{(0)}$.

3 Numerical Studies

3.1 Simulation

We first present simulation results comparing Algorithm 1 (referred to as SARRS in the rest of this section) with the method 1 in Bunea et al. (2012) (referred to as BSW in the rest of this section) where the authors found the best in terms of numerical performance among five different methods. The second step in the BSW approach is carried out by Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ in Section 3 of Bunea et al. (2012), which is also equivalent to Algorithm 1 in Chen and Huang (2012).

To make fair comparison, we use the same simulation setup as in Bunea et al. (2012). In particular, the rows of the design matrix X are i.i.d. random vectors sampled from a multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ, where $\Sigma_{jk} = \rho^{|j-k|}$. The coefficient matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ has the form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} bB_0B_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $b > 0$, $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times r}$ and $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times m}$, where all entries in B_0 and B_1 are filled with i.i.d. random numbers from $N(0,1)$. The noise matrix $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ has i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries. Two settings are considered:

- The $p > n$ case: $n = 30$, $m = 10$, $p = 100$, $s = 15$, $r = 2$, $\rho = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1$, $b = 0.5$ or 1; and
- The $p < n$ case: $n = 100$, $m = 25$, $p = 25$, $s = 15$, $r = 5$, $\rho = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1$, $b = 0.2$ or 0.4.

Large values of b correspond to large signal to noise ratios.

Following Bunea et al. (2012), to minimize the effect of parameter tuning, we generate a large validation data set Y_{vld} (with $n_{\text{vld}} = 10000$ observations) to tune the parameters in both algorithms. The penalty level candidates are taken at a grid of 50 equally spaced values between $(0, \bar{\lambda}]$, where $\bar{\lambda} = 2\sigma \max_j \|X_{*j}\|_2(\sqrt{r} + 2\sqrt{\log p})$. The validation data set is also used to estimate the noise variance σ^2:

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \|Y_{\text{vld}} - PY_{\text{vld}}\|_F^2/(mn_{\text{vld}} - mp),$$

Table 1: Estimation and prediction performance for $p > n$ case.

Method	Penalty	$\|\widehat{Y} - Y\|_F^2/(mn)$	$\|\widehat{A} - A\|_F^2/(mp)$	$\|\text{supp}(\widehat{A})\|$
		$b = 0.5, \quad \widehat{r} = 1.94 \pm 0.24$		
BSW	grLasso	3.299 ± 1.356	0.024 ± 0.012	49.68 ± 12.67
BSW	grMCP	1.780 ± 0.779	0.007 ± 0.007	18.78 ± 3.46
SARRS	grLasso	3.310 ± 1.212	0.024 ± 0.012	53.84 ± 11.64
SARRS	grMCP	1.731 ± 0.398	0.007 ± 0.004	20.62 ± 4.18
		$b = 1, \quad \widehat{r} = 2 \pm 0$		
BSW	grLasso	7.825 ± 6.240	0.066 ± 0.050	54.92 ± 8.55
BSW	grMCP	1.861 ± 1.076	0.008 ± 0.010	17.56 ± 2.48
SARRS	grLasso	7.830 ± 5.054	0.067 ± 0.045	57.52 ± 8.63
SARRS	grMCP	1.926 ± 1.319	0.009 ± 0.013	17.86 ± 2.40

Table 2: Estimation and prediction performance for $p < n$ case.

Method	Penalty	$\|\widehat{Y} - Y\|_F^2/(mn)$	$\|\widehat{A} - A\|_F^2/(mp)$	$\|\text{supp}(\widehat{A})\|$
		$b = 0.2, \quad \widehat{r} = 4.82 \pm 0.39$		
BSW	grLasso	1.103 ± 0.038	0.004 ± 0.001	25 ± 0
BSW	grMCP	1.097 ± 0.038	0.004 ± 0.001	22.68 ± 2.28
SARRS	grLasso	1.103 ± 0.037	0.004 ± 0.001	25 ± 0
SARRS	grMCP	1.098 ± 0.037	0.004 ± 0.001	23.06 ± 2.10
		$b = 0.4, \quad \widehat{r} = 5 \pm 0$		
BSW	grLasso	1.102 ± 0.035	0.004 ± 0.001	25 ± 0
BSW	grMCP	1.089 ± 0.035	0.004 ± 0	22.08 ± 1.87
SARRS	grLasso	1.102 ± 0.035	0.004 ± 0.001	25 ± 0
SARRS	grMCP	1.092 ± 0.035	0.004 ± 0	23.1 ± 1.50

where $P = X(X'X)^{-}X$ is the projection matrix defined in Algorithm 2. For both methods, the initialization is carried out by Algorithm 2 with $\eta = \sqrt{2m} + \sqrt{2(n \wedge p)}$. The iteration in BSW is set to stop when the relative change of the objective function defined in Equation (9) of Bunea et al. (2012) in successive steps is less than 10^{-4}. We use relative rather than absolute change in the stopping criterion to remove the effect of scaling.

In addition to using the group Lasso in steps 1 and 4 of Algorithm 1 and in step (a) in the loop of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ in Bunea et al. (2012), we also study the effect of replacing it with the row ℓ_2-norm group MCP as discussed in Section 2.2.

Table 1 and Table 2 report the means and the standard deviations of the prediction errors, estimation errors and the sizes of selected models based on 50 replications for each setting. In all settings, SARRS and BSW produce comparable results in all the criteria under consideration. For either method, in all settings, group MCP leads to slightly better performance in all the criteria than group Lasso, especially when $p > n$.

The major advantage of SARRS over BSW is in computation cost. We note that the group penalized regression steps are not only key to the nice numerical performance in both algorithms, but also the most time-consuming. Table 3 reports the average numbers of iterations for the BSW approach for each experiment setting. The top panel (overall) gives the average numbers of iterations over all 50 penalty levels and 50 replications, and the bottom panel gives the average numbers of iterations at the penalty level selected by cross validation. When the sample size is

Table 3: Average number of iterations for BSW.

		$(n,p)=(30,100)$		$(n,p)=(100,25)$	
		$b=0.5$	$b=1$	$b=0.2$	$b=0.4$
Overall	grLasso	13.85	16.62	19.18	15.77
	grMCP	13.55	16.31	15.92	9.41
Optimal λ	grLasso	17.66	14.98	3.18	2.00
	grMCP	17.88	13.58	7.26	8.60

small and/or the signal to noise ratio is small (see, e.g., the first column of Table 3), it typically takes BSW around 15 iterations to converge and thus requires performing the group Lasso/MCP computation nearly 15 times at the optimal penalty level selected by cross validation. In contrast, our SARRS procedure only applies the group regression twice and hence reduces the computation cost by up to nearly 85% in such settings. Even with large sample size and strong signal to noise ratio, SARRS still offers reduction in computation cost. In observation of the need of cross validation when these methods are applied to real data, the saving in computation time by our approach can be substantial.

In summary, in all the simulation settings considered, the SARRS approach enjoys as nice numerical performance as the state-of-the-art approach in Bunea et al. (2012) and Chen and Huang (2012) while offering substantial saving in computation cost.

3.2 Breast Cancer Data

To further demonstrate the competitiveness of our method, we present its performance on a public breast cancer data set, which was reported in Chin et al. (2006). We extract the dataset from the R package PMA (Witten et al., 2013).

In this data set, both gene expression and comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) measurements are collected for a set of patient samples. CGH measures DNA copy number variation along each chromosome in cancer samples, which can be helpful in characterizing certain types of cancers. Our goal is to identify a set of genes that are related to copy number changes. The data set consists of $n = 89$ samples, $p = 19672$ gene expression measurements and 2149 CGH measurements on 23 chromosomes. We apply the SARRS method on each chromosome, each of which includes approximately 100 CGH measurements (i.e., $m \approx 100$). All gene expression measurements are used as covariates.

For each chromosome, we split the data into a training set of 60 samples and a testing set of 29 samples in each replication. The training set is used to estimate the coefficient matrix and the testing set is used to measure the prediction error. The penalty level for SARRS is selected by 5-fold cross validation under prediction error on the training data.

We first report the results for Chromosome 1. Using cross validation with group Lasso in SARRS as described at the end of Section 2.3, we estimate the rank by $\widehat{r} = 1$. In addition to the prediction errors by SARRS with group Lasso, we also report results obtained from the following methods:

- CCA-CV: Rank-one maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) after the CCA selection. We first apply the penalized canonical correlation analysis (CCA) in Witten et al. (2009) to detect important genes associated with copy number variation and then compute a rank-one MLE of the coefficient matrix using only the selected genes. The CCA procedure is implemented by the R package PMA and the tuning parameter is selected by cross-validation.

Table 4: Prediction and selection performances on Chromosome 1.

Method	Prediction Error	Model size
SARRS-grLasso	0.0362 ± 0.0054	107.62 ± 55.42
CCA-CV	0.0391 ± 0.0067	125.74 ± 770.04
CCA-fixed	0.0372 ± 0.0059	23
Rank-1 MLE	0.0375 ± 0.0058	19672
Mean Estimator	0.0459 ± 0.0058	19672

Table 5: Prediction and selection performances on Chromosome 23.

Method	Prediction Error	Model size
SARRS-grLasso	0.0301 ± 0.0064	15.9 ± 26.18
CCA-CV	0.0336 ± 0.0086	610.82 ± 1511.59
Rank-1 MLE	0.0342 ± 0.0060	19672
Mean Estimator	0.0316 ± 0.0062	19672

- CCA-fixed: Rank-one MLE with a given set of 23 genes associated with copy number variation reported in Witten et al. (2009), which were also selected by sparse CCA method.
- Rank-1 MLE: The rank-one MLE of the coefficient matrix without any variable selection.
- Mean Estimator: We discard the gene expression information and simply use the mean values (across the training sample) of the CGH data as the predicted values for the testing dataset.

It is also of interest to compare with the prediction errors obtained via a group Lasso estimator of the coefficient matrix, or a rank-one MLE after variable selection using group Lasso. However, due to the large numbers of predictors and responses in the model, the group Lasso computation is formidable. The prediction performance of the BSW method is similar to SARRS, and is hence not reported separately.

Table 4 presents the means and the standard deviations of prediction errors and model sizes based on 50 replications. In terms of prediction error, SARRS with group Lasso is the best. The rank-one MLE with all covariates produces a worse prediction error than SARRS with group Lasso and does not select genes, and hence is less interpretable. SARRS with group Lasso and CCA-CV selects a similar number of genes on average, while variable selection by CCA-CV is much more unstable, as can be seen from the large standard deviation in the sizes of the models selected.

In Table 5, we present the results on Chromosome 23, though we cannot report CCA-fixed since we no longer have a fixed set of selected genes reported by Witten et al. (2009) as we have for Chromosome 1. As in the case of Chromosome 1, SARRS gives the best prediction performance. It is worth noting that both CCA-CV and Rank-1 MLE have higher prediction errors than the naive mean estimator, and variable selection by CCA-CV leads to much larger models than SARRS and is more unstable.

4 Theoretical Properties

In this section, we present a theoretical analysis for the proposed estimation scheme when the noise matrix Z in (1) has i.i.d. normal entries. The proofs of the theoretical results are deferred to Section 5.

4.1 Estimation Error Bounds

To facilitate the discussion, we put the estimation problem in a decision–theoretic framework. We are interested in estimating the coefficient matrix A in model (1) where A is both row sparse and of low rank, and Z has i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries. Thus, we assume that A belongs to the following parameter space

$$\Theta(s, r, d, \gamma) = \left\{ A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m} : \mathsf{rank}(A) = r, \gamma d \geq \sigma_1(A) \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_r(A) > d > 0, |\mathrm{supp}(A)| \leq s \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where for any matrix M, $\mathrm{supp}(M)$ stands for the index set of its nonzero rows. Here and after, we treat γ as an absolute positive constant. To measure the accuracy of any estimator $\widetilde{A}$, we consider the following class of square Schatten norm losses:

$$L_q(A, \widetilde{A}) = \|\widetilde{A} - A\|_{\mathrm{s}_q}^2, \qquad q \in [1, 2]. \quad (9)$$

For simplicity, we assume the noise variance σ^2 is known.

The design matrix We treat the design matrix X be fixed. Without of loss of generality, we assume X is of full rank. Otherwise, we can always perform the following operation to reduce to the full rank case. If $\mathsf{rank}(X) = k < n \wedge p$ and let $O \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ be its left singular vector matrix. Setting $\widetilde{Y} = O'Y$ and $\widetilde{X} = O'X$, we obtain that $\widetilde{Y}$ and $\widetilde{X}$ satisfy model (1) with the same coefficient matrix A, i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ noises and a design matrix of full rank.

We write the singular value decomposition of XA as

$$XA = U \Delta V' \quad (10)$$

with $U \in O(n, r)$, $V \in O(m, r)$ and $\Delta = \mathrm{diag}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_r)$ collects the non-zero singular values of XA. To introduce appropriate assumptions on X, we first make the following definition.

Definition 1. For any $k \in [p]$, the *k-sparse Riesz constants* $\kappa_\pm(k)$ of X are defined as

$$\kappa_-^2(k) = \min_{B \subset [p], |B| = k} \sigma_{\min}(X'_{*B} X_{*B}), \qquad \kappa_+^2(k) = \max_{B \subset [p], |B| = k} \sigma_{\max}(X'_{*B} X_{*B}) \quad (11)$$

By definition, if the k-sparse Riesz constants of X are $\kappa_\pm(k)$, then for any $l \in [k]$, the l-sparse Riesz constants $\kappa_\pm(l)$ of X satisfy $\kappa_-(k) \leq \kappa_-(l) \leq \kappa_+(l) \leq \kappa_+(k)$.

To establish upper bounds for the proposed estimator, for some integer s_* depending only on s, we require the s_*-sparse Riesz constants of X to satisfy the following condition.

Condition 1 (Sparse eigenvalue condition)**.** There exist positive constants s_* and c_* and $K \geq 1$, such that the s_*-sparse Riesz constants satisfy $K^{-1} \leq \kappa_-(s_*) \leq \kappa_+(s_*) \leq K$ and

$$\frac{\kappa_+^2(s_*) - \kappa_-^2(2s_*)}{\kappa_-^2(s_*)} < c_*.$$

We do not put condition on $\kappa_-(2s_*)$. Following the above definition and discussion, we know that $0 \leq \kappa_-(2s_*) \leq \kappa_-(s_*)$ always holds.

Minimax upper bounds We now present high probability error bounds for the estimator obtained via Algorithm 1 when independent samples are used in the initialization and in steps 1, 3 and 4. We believe the extra independence requirement is only an artifact due to the proof technique. Numerical studies show that the algorithm produces comparable results whether independent samples are used or the same sample is used repeatedly.

Note that we can generate the desired independent samples from the observed (X, Y). Indeed, when the noise matrix Z has i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries, we can generate an independent copy $\widetilde{Z}$, then $Z + \widetilde{Z}$ and $Z - \widetilde{Z}$ are independent, each with i.i.d. $N(0, 2\sigma^2)$ entries. Therefore, $Y + \widetilde{Z}$ and $Y - \widetilde{Z}$ are independent, following model (1) with i.i.d. $N(0, 2\sigma^2)$ noises. Employing this trick twice, we can generate four independent copies of responses

$$Y_{(i)} = XA + Z_{(i)}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3,$$

where $Z_{(i)}$ has i.i.d. $N(0, \widetilde{\sigma}^2)$ entries with $\widetilde{\sigma} = 2\sigma$. We reserve $Y_{(0)}$ for initialization. In the rest of this paper, when we mention Algorithm 1, we refer to the procedure with independent samples $Y_{(1)}$, $Y_{(2)}$ and $Y_{(3)}$ used in steps 1, 3 and 4, and $Y_{(0)}$ used for estimating r and computing $V_{(0)}$.

The following theorem gives high probability upper bounds, provided that the initial orthonormal matrix $V_{(0)}$ is not orthogonal to V, i.e., the right singular vector matrix of XA.

Theorem 1. *Let the observed X, Y be generated by (1) with Z having i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries and $A \in \Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$ where $s \geq r \geq 1$. Set the penalty level*

$$\lambda \geq 4\sigma \max_j \|X_{*j}\|(\sqrt{r} + \sqrt{4 \log p}) \tag{12}$$

in steps 1 and 4 of Algorithm 1 with the group Lasso penalty (5). Suppose that Condition 1 holds with an absolute constant $K > 1$ and positive constants s_*, c_* satisfying

$$s_* \geq 2s, \quad 6c_* \leq \sqrt{s_*/s - 1}, \tag{13}$$

and that there exist an absolute constants $c_0 > 0$ and a sufficient small constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sigma_r(V' V_{(0)}) \geq c_0, \quad \sqrt{s}\lambda/d \leq c_1. \tag{14}$$

Then uniformly over $\Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$ in (8), with probability at least $1 - 3p^{-1}$, the output $\widehat{A}$ of Algorithm 1 satisfies

$$L_q(A, \widehat{A}) \leq C r^{2/q-1}(\sigma^2 rm + s\lambda^2), \qquad \text{for all } q \in [1, 2]$$

where C is a constant depending only on $\kappa_\pm(s_*), \gamma, c_*, c_0$ and c_1.

Remark 2. Note that one can always multiply X and divide A by the same nonzero constant, and model (1) essentially do not change. Therefore, to put A in an appropriate parameter space, one needs to have an appropriate scaling of X. In Theorem 1, the scaling of X is fulfilled by the requirement of its s_*-sparse Riesz constants to be bounded from above and below by absolute positive constants.

Remark 3. Under the condition of Theorem 1, with the optimal choice of λ in (12), the estimation errors of Algorithm 1 have the upper bounds

$$\|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\mathrm{s}_q}^2 \leq C\sigma^2 r^{2/q-1}\{r(m + s) + s \log p\}, \tag{15}$$

with high probability for all $q \in [1, 2]$.

Remark 4. Theorem 1 is stated by assuming the existence of a good initial matrix $V_{(0)}$ and a correct selection for the rank r of A. As we shall show in Section 4.2 below, such an assumption holds with high probability for the initialization methods proposed in Section 2.3 under mild conditions.

Remark 5. In penalized linear regression, the estimation consistency is studied under the restricted isometry property and its variations. The sparse eigenvalue condition in the theorem is one of the widely-used regularity conditions. Here we require the sparse eigenvalue not to be excessively large as per (13), which allows us to make use of the theoretical results of group Lasso in Huang and Zhang (2010). In principle, this condition can be replaced with a restricted eigenvalue type condition, which also guarantees the optimal error rate for group Lasso (Lounici et al., 2011).

Minimax lower bounds The following theorem provides minimax risk lower bounds for estimating A under all loss functions in (9).

Theorem 2. *Let the observed X, Y be generated by (1) with Z having i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries. Suppose that the coefficient matrix $A \in \Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$ for some $s \geq 2r$ and that the $(2s)$-sparse Riesz constants of the design matrix X satisfy $K^{-1} \leq \kappa_-(2s) \leq \kappa_+(2s) \leq K$ for some absolute constant $K > 1$. Then there exists a positive constant c depending only on γ and $\kappa_+(2s)$ such that the minimax risk for estimating A satisfies*

$$\inf_{\widehat{A}} \sup_{\Theta} \mathbb{E} L_q(A, \widehat{A}) \geq c\sigma^2 \left\{ \left(r^{2/q-1} \frac{d^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \wedge \left[r^{2/q}(s+m) + r^{2/q-1} s \log \frac{ep}{s} \right] \right\}, \tag{16}$$

for all $q \in [1, 2]$.

Remark 6. Under conditions (12) and (14) of Theorem 1, the first term in (16) does not take effect in the lower bound. Note that the choice of the tuning parameter λ in (12) does not depend on the knowledge of the model parameters as long as the rank r can be consistently estimated, which will be established in Section 4.2 below. In view of (15), we can thus conclude that under the conditions of Theorems 1 and 3 (or the conditions of Theorems 1 and 4), Algorithm 1 attains nearly optimal rates of convergence adaptively for all losses in (9). In addition, if the sparsity level $s \leq p^{1-\beta}$ for some absolute constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then the rates in (15) and (16) match exactly.

4.2 Initialization

The following theorems guarantee the desired properties of the initial estimates given in Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3. We use $Y_{(0)}$ in both algorithm to guarantee the independence of $V_{(0)}$. Recall that $Y_{(0)} = XA + Z_{(0)}$, where $Z_{(0)}$ has i.i.d. $N(0, \widetilde{\sigma}^2)$ entries with $\widetilde{\sigma} = 2\sigma$ and $A \in \Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$.

Theorem 3 (Initialization I)**.** *Let $q = n \wedge p$. Let $\widehat{r}$ and $V_{(0)}$ be the output of Algorithm 2 with $\eta \geq 2(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{m+q}})(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})/\xi$ in step 2, with $\xi \in (0, 1]$ being an absolute constant. Suppose $\log p < (m+q)/2$, $2\sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q}) < c_1 d$ for a sufficient small constant c_1 and*

$$\delta_r = \sigma_r(XA) \geq (1 + \xi)\sigma\eta.$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$,

$$\widehat{r} = r, \quad \sigma_r(V' V_{(0)}) > c_0,$$

where c_0 is a constant depending only on c_1, $\kappa_-(s_*)$.

Theorem 4 (Initialization II). *Let $\widehat{r}$ and $V^{(0)}$ be the output of Algorithm 3 with $\lambda_0 = 4\sigma \max_j \|X_{*j}\|(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{4\log p})$ in step 1 and $\eta \geq 2C_0\sqrt{s(m+4\log p)}/\xi$ for a sufficiently large constant C_0 depending on $\kappa_\pm(s_*)$ and c_* and an absolute constant $\xi \in (0,1]$. Suppose $\sigma\sqrt{s(m+4\log p)} < c_1 d$ for a sufficient small constant c_1 and*

$$\delta_r = \sigma_r(XA) \geq (1+\xi)\sigma\eta.$$

Then, with probability at least $1-p^{-1}$,

$$\widehat{r} = r, \quad \sigma_r(V'V^{(0)}) > c_0,$$

where c_0 is a constant only depending on c_1, C, $\kappa_\pm(s_*)$ and c_*.

Remark 7. In Theorem 4, the thresholding level η involves the model sparsity s. To make Algorithm 3 completely data-driven, we may replace it with $s_0 = |\mathrm{supp}(A_{(0)})|$, where $A_{(0)}$ is the matrix obtained in step 1. Lounici et al. (2011) showed that group Lasso leads to an over selection of the true model under a uniform signal strength condition that prevents some arbitrarily small signals on nonzero rows. When this is the case, the use of s_0 is justified since we only need an over estimate of s for the purpose of initialization.

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Equation (4)

We first show that for $\widehat{A}$ defined in (2),

$$\widehat{A}\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' = \widehat{A}. \tag{17}$$

To this end, let the columns of $\widetilde{V}_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times(m-r)}$ be a set of basis of the orthogonal complement of the column space of $\widetilde{V}$. Then we decompose any $T \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times m}$ as $T = T_1 + T_2$, where

$$T_1 = T\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}', \qquad T_2 = T\widetilde{V}_\perp\widetilde{V}_\perp'.$$

Then the objective function satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XT\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(T;\lambda) &= \|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XT_1 - XT_2\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(T;\lambda) \\
&= \|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XT_1\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \|XT_2\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(T;\lambda) \\
&\geq \|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XT_1\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(T;\lambda) \\
&\geq \|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XT_1\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(T_1;\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second equality is due to the Pythagorean theorem, and the last inequality holds since $\|\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}'\|_{\mathrm{op}} = 1$ and so the row norms of T_1 are always no greater than the corresponding row norms of T. The claim (17) is then a direct consequence of the last display.

In view of (17), we have $\widehat{A} = \widehat{B}\widetilde{V}'$ where

$$\widehat{B} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{B\in\mathbb{R}^{p\times r}} \left\{ \|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XB\widetilde{V}'\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2/2 + \rho(B\widetilde{V}';\lambda) \right\}.$$

The desired claim (4) is then a direct consequence of the equalities:

$$\|Y\widetilde{V}\widetilde{V}' - XB\widetilde{V}'\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = \|Y\widetilde{V} - XB\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|B_{i*}\| = \|B_{i*}\widetilde{V}'\| = \|(B\widetilde{V}')_{i*}\|, \quad \forall B \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times r}, i \in [p].$$

Here, both equalities hold since $\widetilde{V}$ is orthonormal. This completes the proof of (4).

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1

To prove Theorem 1, we first analyze the $U_{(1)}$ and $V_{(1)}$ matrices obtained as intermediate results in Algorithm 1. Throughout the proof, Theorem 5 (stated and proved in Section 5.5) on group Lasso estimators will be used repeatedly.

Analysis of $U_{(1)}$ We now analyze the property of the intermediate left singular vector matrix $U_{(1)}$ obtained in step 2 of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 1. *Under the condition of Theorem 1, there exists a constant C depending only on $\kappa_{\pm}(s_*), c_*$ and c_0, such that with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$,*

$$\|U_{(1)}U_{(1)}' - UU'\|_F \leq C\sqrt{s}\lambda/d.$$

Proof of Lemma 1. Let $U_* \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times r}$ be the left singular vector matrix of $XAV_{(0)} = UDV'V_{(0)}$. Under condition (14), $V'V_{(0)}$ is an $r \times r$ matrix of full rank, and so the column space of U^* is the same as the column space of U; i.e., $U_*U_*' = UU'$. By Wedin's $\sin\theta$ Theorem (Wedin, 1972),

$$\|U_{(1)}U_{(1)}' - UU'\|_F = \|U_{(1)}U_{(1)}' - U_*U_*'\|_F \leq \frac{\|XB_{(1)} - XAV_{(0)}\|_F}{\sigma_r(XAV_{(0)})},$$

where $\sigma_r(XAV_{(0)})$ is the r^{th} singular value of $XAV_{(0)}$. Note that $XAV_{(0)} = XAVV'V_{(0)}$, and so

$$\sigma_r(XAV_{(0)}) \geq \sigma_r(XAV)\sigma_r(V'V_{(0)}) \geq c_0\delta_r,$$

where the last inequality holds under condition (14) since $\sigma_r(XAV) = \sigma_r(XA) = \delta_r$. Further note that

$$\|XB_{(1)} - XAV_{(0)}\|_F \leq \kappa_+(2s)\|B_{(1)} - AV_{(0)}\|_F \leq \kappa_+(s_*)\|B_{(1)} - AV_{(0)}\|_F$$

and that $\delta_r \geq \kappa_-(s)\sigma_r(A) \geq \kappa_-(s_*)d$, the desired result then follows from Part (ii) of Theorem 5 with $\eta = 1/p$. □

Analysis of $V_{(1)}$ We now analyze the matrix $V_{(1)} \in O(m, r)$ obtained in step 3 of Algorithm 1. The condition in the following lemma is satisfied when $\sqrt{s}\lambda/d < c_1$ for some sufficient small positive constant c_1.

Lemma 2. *Suppose $\|U_{(1)}U_{(1)}' - UU'\|_F < c_1'$ for a sufficiently small positive constant c_1'. Then there exists a constant C depending only on $\kappa_{\pm}(s_*), \gamma$ and c_1' such that with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$,*

$$\|V_{(1)}V_{(1)}' - VV'\|_F \leq C\frac{\sigma(\sqrt{mr} + \sqrt{2\log p})}{d}.$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Note that VV' is the projection matrix onto the subspace spanned by the right singular vectors of $U_{(1)}U_{(1)}'XA$. Thus, Wedin's $\sin\theta$ theorem (Wedin, 1972) gives the bound

$$\|V_{(1)}V_{(1)}' - VV'\|_F \leq \frac{\|U_{(1)}U_{(1)}'Y_{(2)} - U_{(1)}U_{(1)}'XA\|_F}{\sigma_r(U_{(1)}U_{(1)}'XA)}. \tag{18}$$

To upper bound the numerator, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|U_{(1)}U'_{(1)}Y_{(2)} - U_{(1)}U'_{(1)}XA\|_F^2 &= \|U_{(1)}U'_{(1)}Z_{(2)}\|_F^2 \\ &\le \|U_{(1)}\|^2 \cdot \|U'_{(1)}Z_{(2)}\|_F^2 \\ &\le \|U'_{(1)}Z_{(2)}\|_F^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $Z_{(2)}$ is independent of $U_{(1)}$, $U'_{(1)}Z_{(2)}$ is an $r \times m$ matrix with iid $N(0, 4\sigma^2)$ entries. Thus, $\|U'_{(1)}Z_{(2)}\|_F^2/(4\sigma^2)$ follows a χ^2 distribution with mr degrees of freedom. By Laurent and Massart (2000, Eq.(4.3)), it holds with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$,

$$\|U'_{(1)}Z_{(2)}\|_F^2 \le 4\sigma^2\Big(mr + 2\sqrt{mr\log p} + 2\log p\Big) \le 4\sigma^2(\sqrt{mr} + \sqrt{2\log p})^2\,. \tag{19}$$

To lower bound the denominator, we apply Weyl's theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_r(U_{(1)}U'_{(1)}XA) &\ge \sigma_r(UU'XA) - \|U_{(1)}U'_{(1)}XA - UU'XA\|_{\mathrm{op}} \\ &\ge \delta_r - \|U_{(1)}U'_{(1)} - UU'\|_{\mathrm{op}}\|XA\|_{\mathrm{op}}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\delta_r \ge \kappa_-(s_*)d$, $\|XA\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le \kappa_+(s_*)\gamma d$ and that $\|U_{(1)}U'_{(1)} - UU'\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le \|U_{(1)}U'_{(1)} - UU'\|_F \le c'_1$. Thus, for sufficiently small value of c'_1, we obtain

$$\sigma_r(U_{(1)}U'_{(1)}XA) \ge C^{-1}d, \tag{20}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\kappa_\pm(s_*)$, γ and c'_1. Combining (18) – (20), we complete the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1 To start with, observe that $AVV' = A$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{A} - A\|_F &= \|B_{(2)}V'_{(1)} - A\|_F \\ &\le \|B_{(2)}V'_{(1)} - AV_{(1)}V'_{(1)}\|_F + \|AV_{(1)}V'_{(1)} - AVV'\|_F \\ &\le \|V_{(1)}\|_{\mathrm{op}}\|B_{(2)} - AV_{(1)}\|_F + \|A\|_{\mathrm{op}}\|V_{(1)}V'_{(1)} - VV'\|_F.\end{aligned}$$

To control the first term on the rightmost side, we have $\|V_{(1)}\|_{\mathrm{op}} = 1$. Applying Part (ii) of Theorem 5 with $W = Y_{(3)}V_{(1)}$ and $B = AV_{(1)}$, we obtain that with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$,

$$\|B_{(2)} - AV_{(1)}\|_F \le C\sqrt{s}\lambda,$$

where C is a constant depending only on $\kappa_\pm(s_*)$ and c_*.

To control the second term, note that $\|A\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le \gamma d$. Moreover, by Lemma 1 and the condition of the theorem, the condition of Lemma 2 is satisfied with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$, and so with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1}$,

$$\|V_{(1)}V'_{(1)} - VV'\|_F \le C\frac{\sigma(\sqrt{mr} + \sqrt{2\log p})}{d}.$$

Assembling these bounds, we obtain that with probability at least $1 - 3p^{-1}$,

$$\|\widehat{A} - A\|_F^2 \le C(\sigma^2 rm + \sigma^2\log p + s\lambda^2) \le C(\sigma^2 rm + s\lambda^2).$$

Here, the second inequality holds when λ satisfies (12). The desired upper bound on other Schatten norm losses is a simple consequence of the above bound and the inequality $\|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\mathrm{S}_q}^2 \le (2r)^{2/q-1}\|\widehat{A} - A\|_F^2$ for all $q \in [1, 2]$, since the rank of $\widehat{A} - A$ is at most $2r$. □

5.3 Proof of Theorem 2

For any probability distributions P and Q, let $D(P||Q)$ denote the Kullback–Leibler divergence of Q from P. For any subset K of $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, the volume of K is $\mathrm{vol}(K) = \int_K \mathrm{d}\mu$ where $\mathrm{d}\mu$ is the usual Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ by taking the product measure of the Lebesgue measures of individual entries. With these definitions, we state the following variant of Fano's lemma (Ibragimov and Has'minskii, 1981; Birgé, 1983; Tsybakov, 2009). This version has been established as Proposition 1 in Ma and Wu (2013). It will be used repeatedly in the proof of the lower bounds. Throughout the proof, we denote $\kappa_+(2s)$ by κ_+.

Proposition 1. *Let (Θ, ρ) be a metric space and $\{P_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ a collection of probability measures. For any totally bounded $T \subset \Theta$, denote by $\mathcal{M}(T, \rho, \epsilon)$ the ϵ-packing number of T with respect to ρ, i.e., the maximal number of points in T whose pairwise minimum distance in ρ is at least ϵ. Define the* Kullback-Leibler diameter *of T by*

$$d_{\mathrm{KL}}(T) \triangleq \sup_{\theta,\theta'\in T} D(P_\theta \,||\, P_{\theta'}). \tag{21}$$

Then

$$\inf_{\hat\theta}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta[\rho^2(\hat\theta(X),\theta)] \ge \sup_{T\subset\Theta}\sup_{\epsilon>0} \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}\left(1 - \frac{d_{\mathrm{KL}}(T)+\log 2}{\log \mathcal{M}(T,\rho,\epsilon)}\right). \tag{22}$$

In particular, if $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\|\cdot\|$ is some norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$, then

$$\inf_{\hat\theta}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta[\|\hat\theta(X)-\theta\|^2] \ge \sup_{T\subset\Theta}\sup_{\epsilon>0} \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}\left(1 - \frac{d_{\mathrm{KL}}(T)+\log 2}{\log \frac{\mathrm{vol}(T)}{\mathrm{vol}(B_{\|\cdot\|}(\epsilon))}}\right). \tag{23}$$

We first prove an oracle version of the lower bound. One can think of it as an lower bound for the minimax risk when we know that the nonzero entries of the coefficient matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times m}$ are restricted to the top–left $s \times r$ block.

Lemma 3. *Let $\Theta_0(s, r, d, \gamma) \subset \Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$ be the sub-collection of all matrices whose nonzero entries are in the top-left $s \times r$ block. Suppose $\sigma = 1$. There exists a positive constant c that depends only on κ_+ and γ, such that for any $q \in [1, 2]$, the minimax risk for estimating A over Θ_0 satisfies*

$$\inf_{\widehat{A}}\sup_{\Theta_0} \mathbb{E} L_q(A, \widehat{A}) \ge c\left[(r^{2/q-1}d^2) \wedge (r^{2/q}s)\right].$$

Proof. By a simple sufficiency argument, we can reduce to model (1) with $p = s$ and $m = r$, which we assume in the rest of this proof without loss of generality.

Let $A_0 = \mathrm{diag}(1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$. Moreover, for any δ and any $q \in [1, 2]$, let $B_{\mathrm{S}_q}(\delta) = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r} : \|A\|_{\mathrm{s}_q} \le \delta\}$ denote the Schatten-q ball with radius δ in $\mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$. For some constant $a > 0$ to be specified later, define

$$T(a) = \frac{\gamma d}{2}A_0 + B_{\mathrm{S}_2}(\sqrt{a}) = \left\{\frac{\gamma d}{2}A_0 + M : M \in B_{\mathrm{S}_2}(\sqrt{a})\right\}. \tag{24}$$

For any $A_1, A_2 \in T(a)$, we have

$$D(P_{A_1}||P_{A_2}) = \frac{1}{2}\|XA_1 - XA_2\|_{\mathrm{S}_2}^2 \le \frac{1}{2}\|X\|_{\mathrm{op}}^2\|A_1 - A_2\|_{\mathrm{S}_2}^2 \le 2\kappa_+^2 a.$$

Here, the last inequality holds since $\|X\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le \kappa_+$ under the assumption that $X \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$ and $\|A_1 - A_2\|_{\mathrm{S}_2}^2 \le 4a$ by definition (24). So

$$d_{\mathrm{KL}}(T(a)) \le 2\kappa_+^2 a. \tag{25}$$

By the inverse Santalo's inequality (see, e.g., Lemma 3 of Ma and Wu (2013)), for some universal constants c_0,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{vol}(T(a))^{\frac{1}{sr}} &= \mathrm{vol}(B_{\mathrm{S}_2}(\sqrt{a}))^{\frac{1}{sr}} = \sqrt{a}\cdot \mathrm{vol}(B_{\mathrm{S}_2}(1))^{\frac{1}{sr}} \\ &\ge \sqrt{a}\cdot \frac{c_0}{\mathbb{E}\,\|Z\|_{\mathrm{S}_2}} \qquad (26)\\ &\ge \sqrt{a}\cdot \frac{c_0'}{\sqrt{sr}}. \qquad (27)\end{aligned}$$

In (26), Z is a $s\times r$ matrix with i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries. The inequality in (27) holds since by Jensen's inequality, $\mathbb{E}\,\|Z\|_{\mathrm{S}_2} \le \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\,\|Z\|_{\mathrm{S}_2}^2} = \sqrt{sr}$.

On the other hand, by Urysohn's inequality (see, e.g., Eq.(19) of Ma and Wu (2013)), for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in [1,2]$,

$$\mathrm{vol}(B_{\mathrm{S}_q}(\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{sr}} \le \frac{\epsilon\mathbb{E}\,\|Z\|_{\mathrm{S}_{q'}}}{\sqrt{sr}} \le \frac{\epsilon r^{\frac{1}{q'}}\mathbb{E}\|Z\|_{\mathrm{op}}}{\sqrt{sr}} \le 2\epsilon r^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Here, $\frac{1}{q'}+\frac{1}{q}=1$ and Z is a $s\times r$ matrix with i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries. The last inequality is due to Gordon's inequality (see, e.g., Davidson and Szarek (2001)): $\mathbb{E}\|Z\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le \sqrt{s}+\sqrt{r} \le 2\sqrt{s}$.

Now let

$$a = \left(\frac{\gamma\wedge 2-1}{2}\right)^2 (sr\wedge d^2), \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon = \frac{c_0'}{2\kappa_+}\sqrt{a}\, r^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{28}$$

Then for any $A \in T(a)$ and any $i \in [r]$, $|\sigma_i(A) - \frac{\gamma}{2}d| \le \sqrt{a} \le \frac{\gamma\wedge 2-1}{2}d$, and so $\sigma_i(A) \in [d, \gamma d]$ and $T(a) \subset \Theta_0(s,r,d,\gamma)$. Applying Proposition 1 with $T(a)$ and ϵ in (24) and (28), we obtain a lower bound on the order of ϵ^2. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4. *Let $s \ge r$ be positive integers. There exist a matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$ and two absolute constants $c_0 \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $c_1 > 0$ such that $\|W\|_{\mathrm{F}} \le 1$ and for any subset $B \subset [s]$ such that $|B| \ge c_0 s$, $\|W_{B*}\|_{\mathrm{s}_q} \ge c_1 r^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}}$ for any $q \in [1,2]$.*

Proof. We divide the proof into two cases, namely when $s \ge 25$ and when $s < 25$.

1° When $s \ge 25$, let $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$ have i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries. Then $\|Z\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \sim \chi_{sr}^2$, and Laurent and Massart (2000, Eq.(4.3)) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|Z\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \ge sr + 2s\sqrt{r} + 2s\right\} \le \mathrm{e}^{-s}.$$

Moreover, for any $c_0 > \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left\{\exists B\subset[s], \text{s.t.}\,|B| = c_0 s \ \text{ and } \ \sigma_r(Z_{B*}) < \sqrt{c_0 s} - \sqrt{r} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c_0 s}\right\}\\ &\le \sum_{B\subset[s],|B|=c_0 s} \mathbb{P}\left\{\sigma_r(Z_{B*}) < \sqrt{c_0 s} - \sqrt{r} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c_0 s}\right\}\\ &\le \binom{s}{(1-c_0)s}\mathrm{e}^{-c_0 s/4}\\ &\le \exp\left\{-s\left[\frac{c_0}{4} + (1-c_0)\log(1-c_0)\right]\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first inequality is due to the union bound, the second inequality is due to the Davidson-Szarek bound, and the last inequality holds since for any $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $\binom{s}{\alpha s} = \binom{s}{(1-\alpha)s} \le (\frac{\mathrm{e}}{1-\alpha})^{(1-\alpha)s}$. If we set $c_0 \ge 0.96$, then the multiplier $\frac{c_0}{4} + (1-c_0)\log(1-c_0) \ge 0.1$.

So when $c_0 = 0.96$ and $s \ge 25$, the sum of the right hand sides of the last two displays is less than 1. Thus, there exists a deterministic matrix Z_0 on which both events happen. Now define $W = Z_0/\|Z_0\|_{\mathrm{F}}$. Then $\|W\|_{\mathrm{F}} = 1$ by definition, and for any $B \subset [s]$ with $|B| = c_0 s$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W_{B*}\|_{\mathrm{s}_q} &\ge r^{1/q}\sigma_r(W_{B*}) \\
&= r^{1/q}\sigma_r((Z_0)_{B*})/\|Z_0\|_{\mathrm{F}} \\
&\ge r^{1/q}\frac{\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c_0 s} - \sqrt{r}}{\sqrt{sr + 2s\sqrt{r} + 2r}} \\
&\ge c_1 r^{1/q-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the last inequality holds with an absolute constant c_1 when $r \le \frac{1}{8}c_0 s$. When $r > \frac{1}{8}c_0 s$, we can always let $\tilde{r} = \frac{1}{8}c_0 r \le \frac{1}{8}c_0 s$ and repeat the above arguments on the $s \times \tilde{r}$ submatrix of Z consisting of its first $\tilde{r}$ columns, and the conclusion continues to hold with a modified absolute constant c_1. This completes the proof for all subsets B with $|B| = c_0 s$. The claim continues to hold for all $|B| \ge c_0 s$ since the Schatten-q norm of a submatrix is always no smaller than the the whole matrix.

2° When $s < 25$, we have $r < 25$ since $r \le s$ always holds. Let $W = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\mathbf{1}_s \quad \mathbf{0}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$, i.e., the first column of W consists of s entries all equal to $1/\sqrt{s}$ and the rest are all zeros. So W is rank one. It is straightforward to verify the desired conclusion holds since for any $B \subset [s]$, $\|W_{B*}\|_{\mathrm{s}_q} = \|W_{B*}\|_{\mathrm{F}} = \sqrt{|B|/s}$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 5. *Let $a = d^2 \wedge s\log\frac{\mathrm{e}p}{s}$. There exist three positive constants c_1, c_2, c_3 that depend only on γ and κ_+, and a subset $\Theta_1 \subset \Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$, such that $c_3 \le c_2/3$, $d_{\mathrm{KL}}(\Theta_1) \le c_3 a$ and that for any $q \in [1, 2]$,*

$$\log \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{s}_q}, c_1\sqrt{a}\, r^{1/q-1/2}) \ge c_2 s\log\frac{\mathrm{e}p}{s},$$

where d_{KL} is the Kullback-Leibler diameter and $\mathcal{M}$ is the packing number defined in Proposition 1.

Proof. Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{(s-r)\times r}$ satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 4 and define $s_0 = (1-c_0)(s-r)$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_N\}$ be a maximal set consisting of subsets of $[p]\backslash[r]$ with cardinality $s-r$ and for any $B_i \ne B_j$, $|B_i \cap B_j| \le s_0$. By Lemma A.3 of Rigollet and Tsybakov (2011) and Lemma 2.9 of Tsybakov (2009), there exists an absolute positive constant c_2' such that

$$\log N \ge c_2'(s-r)\log\frac{\mathrm{e}(p-r)}{s-r}.$$

Now for each $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$, define $W^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ by setting the submatrix $W^{(i)}_{B_i[r]} = W$ and filling the remaining entries with zeros. Then for any $i \ne j$, $|B_i \cap B_j| \le s_0$, and so there exists a set $B_{ij} \subset [s]$ with $|B_{ij}| \ge s - r - s_0 = c_0(s-r)$, such that

$$\|W^{(i)} - W^{(j)}\|_{\mathrm{s}_q} \ge \|W_{B_{ij}*}\|_{\mathrm{s}_q} \ge c_1' r^{1/q-1/2},$$

where c_1' is an absolute constant due to Lemma 4.

Define $M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times m}$ and for some positive constant $c_1'' \le \frac{\gamma\wedge 2-1}{2} \wedge \sqrt{\frac{c_2'}{6\kappa_+^2}}$, let

$$\Theta_1 = \left\{ A^{(i)} = \frac{\gamma d}{2} M_0 + c_1'' \sqrt{a}\, W^{(i)} : i = 1, \ldots, N \right\}.$$

Note that each $A^{(i)}$ has s nonzero rows and r nonzero columns. Moreover, for $i \in [N]$, and $j \in [r]$

$$\left| \sigma_j(A^{(i)}) - \sigma_j(\frac{\gamma d}{2} M_0) \right| \le \|A^{(i)} - \frac{\gamma d}{2} M_0\|_{\mathrm{op}} = c_1'' \sqrt{a} \|W^{(i)}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le c_1'' \sqrt{a} \|W^{(i)}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \le \frac{\gamma \wedge 2 - 1}{2} d.$$

Here, the second last inequality holds since $\|W^{(i)}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le \|W^{(i)}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \le 1$, and the last inequality holds since $c_1'' \le \frac{\gamma\wedge 2-1}{2}$ and $\sqrt{a} \le d$. Since $\sigma_j(\frac{\gamma d}{2} M_0) = \frac{\gamma d}{2}$ for all $j \in [r]$, and so $\sigma_j(A^{(i)}) \in [d, \gamma d]$ for all $j \in [r]$ and $i \in [N]$. Thus, $\Theta_1 \subset \Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$.

For any $i \neq j$, $D(P_{A^{(i)}} || P_{A^{(j)}}) = \frac{1}{2}\|XA^{(i)} - XA^{(j)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \le (c_1'' \kappa_+)^2 a$, and

$$\|A^{(i)} - A^{(j)}\|_{\mathrm{s}_q} \ge c_1'' c_1' \sqrt{a}\, r^{1/q - 1/2}.$$

Hence, for $c_1 = c_1' c_1''$, $c_2 = c_2'/2$ and $c_3 = (c_1'' \kappa_+)^2$, $d_{\mathrm{KL}}(\mathcal{F}_0) \le c_3 a$ and

$$\log \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{s}_q}, c_1 \sqrt{a}\, r^{1/q-1/2}) \ge c_2'(s - r) \log \frac{\mathrm{e}(p-r)}{s-r} \ge c_2 s \log \frac{\mathrm{e}p}{s}.$$

Here, the second inequality holds since $s \ge 2r$ and $\frac{p-r}{s-r} \ge \frac{p}{s}$. Moreover, by our choice of c_3, it is guaranteed that $c_3 \le c_2/3$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Throughout the proof, let $c > 0$ denote a generic constant that depends only on γ and κ_+, though its actual value might vary at different occurrences. Note that we only need to prove the lower bounds for $\sigma = 1$, and the case of $\sigma \neq 1$ follows directly from standard scaling argument.

First, by restricting the nonzero entries of any matrix in $\Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$ to the top left $s \times r$ corner, we obtain a minimax lower bound by applying Lemma 3, i.e., for $\Theta = \Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$ and any $q \in [1, 2]$,

$$\inf_{\widehat{A}} \sup_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\mathrm{s}_q}^2 \ge c(r^{2/q-1} d^2) \wedge (r^{2/q} s). \tag{29}$$

Next, by restricting the nonzero entries of any matrix in $\Theta(s, r, d, \gamma)$ to the top r rows, we obtain a minimax lower bound by similar arguments to those leading to Lemma 3:

$$\inf_{\widehat{A}} \sup_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\mathrm{s}_q}^2 \ge c(r^{2/q-1} d^2) \wedge (r^{2/q} m). \tag{30}$$

Last but not least, by Proposition 1 and Lemma 5, for $a = d^2 \wedge s \log \frac{\mathrm{e}p}{s}$, we obtain

$$\inf_{\widehat{A}} \sup_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\mathrm{s}_q}^2 \ge c(\sqrt{a}\, r^{1/q-1/2})^2 = c(r^{2/q-1} d^2) \wedge \left(r^{2/q-1} s \log \frac{\mathrm{e}p}{s} \right). \tag{31}$$

Thus, the minimax risk is lower bounded by the maximum of the four lower bounds in (29)–(31). Applying repeatedly the fact that for any $a, b, c > 0$, $(a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c) = a \wedge (b \vee c) \asymp a \wedge (b + c)$, we complete the proof. □

5.4 Proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4

The proofs of the properties of initial values require the following lemma.

Lemma 6 (Rank estimation). *Let M be an $n \times m$ matrix, and $\widehat{r} = \max\{j : \sigma_j(M) \geq \mu\}$. Suppose that $\delta_r = \sigma_r(XA) > (1+\xi)\mu$ for $\xi \in (0,1]$. Then*

$$P\{\widehat{r} = r\} \geq 1 - P\{\sigma_1(M - XA) \geq \xi\mu\}.$$

Proof of Lemma 6. By the definition of $\widehat{r}$, we have

$$P\{\widehat{r} \neq r\} = P\Big\{\sigma_{r+1}(M) \geq \mu \text{ or } \sigma_r(M) < \mu\Big\}.$$

Since $\delta_r - \sigma_r(M) \leq \sigma_1(M - XA)$ and $\sigma_{r+1}(M) \leq \sigma_1(M - XA)$,

$$\begin{aligned} P\{\widehat{r} \neq r\} &\leq P\Big\{\sigma_1(M - XA) \geq \mu \text{ or } \sigma_1(M - XA) \geq \delta_r - \mu\Big\} \\ &\leq P\Big\{\sigma_1(M - XA) \geq \min(\mu, \xi\mu) = \xi\mu\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. By Lemma 3 of Bunea et al. (2011),

$$P\Big\{\sigma_1(PZ_{(0)}) > 2\sigma\Big\{1 + \sqrt{\frac{2\log p}{m+q}}\Big\}(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})\Big\} \quad \leq \quad p^{-1}.$$

Applying Lemma 6 with $M = PY_{(0)}$, we obtain

$$P\{\widehat{r} = r\} \geq 1 - P\Big\{\sigma_1(PZ_{(0)}) \geq 2\sigma\Big\{1 + \sqrt{\frac{2\log p}{m+q}}\Big\}(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})\Big\} \geq 1 - p^{-1}.$$

By Wedin's $\sin\theta$ Theorem, in the event of $\widehat{r} = r$ it holds that

$$\|V_{(0)}V_{(0)}' - VV'\| \leq \frac{\|PY_{(0)} - XA\|}{\sigma_r(PY_{(0)})} \leq \frac{\sigma_1(PZ_{(0)})}{\delta_r - \sigma_1(PZ_{(0)})} \leq \frac{4\sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})}{(\kappa_-(s_*) - 4c_1)d}.$$

The second inequality follows from $\sigma_r(PY_{(0)}) \geq \delta_r - \sigma_1(PZ_{(0)})$ by Weyl's Theorem, and the last inequality follows from $\delta_r \geq \kappa_-(s_*)d$, $2\log p < m + q$ and $\sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q}) < c_1 d$.

Note that for any unit vector x,

$$\begin{aligned} \|V'V_{(0)}x\|^2 &= x'V_{(0)}'VV'V_{(0)}x \\ &= 1 - x'V_{(0)}'(VV' - V_{(0)}V_{(0)}')V_{(0)}x \\ &\geq 1 - \|VV' - V_{(0)}V_{(0)}'\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\sigma_r^2(V'V_{(0)}) = \min_{\|x\|=1}\|V'V_{(0)}x\|^2 \geq 1 - \|VV' - V_{(0)}V_{(0)}'\|$. When c_1 is small enough, this completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 4. By Theorem 5, it holds with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$,

$$\|XA_{(0)} - XA\| \leq \|XA_{(0)} - XA\|_F \leq \kappa_+(2s)\|A_{(0)} - A\|_F \leq C\sigma\sqrt{ms + 4s\log p},$$

where C is a constant only depending on $\kappa_\pm(s_*)$ and c_*. Theorem 4 then follows Lemma 6 with $M = XA_{(0)}$ and the same argument in the proof of Theorem 3. □

5.5 A Theorem on Group Lasso

Theorem 5. *Consider the linear model $W = XB + Z$, where W is an $n \times r$ response matrix, X is an $n \times p$ design matrix, B is a $p \times r$ coefficient matrix with s-sparse row support for some $s \geq 1$, and Z is an $n \times r$ error matrix. Let*

$$\widehat{B} = \underset{B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}}{\arg\min} \|W - XB\|_F^2/2 + \lambda \|B\|_{2,1},$$

with a given penalty level λ. Let Condition 1 hold with an absolute constant $K > 1$ and positive constants s_*, c_* satisfying (13).
(i) If $2\|X'_{*j}(W - XB)\|_F \leq \lambda$ for all j, then it holds that

$$\|\widehat{B} - B\|_F \leq \frac{3(1 + (4c_*)^{-1})}{\kappa_-^2(s_*)} \sqrt{s}\lambda. \tag{32}$$

(ii) Assume the error matrix Z has iid $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries. For any given $\eta \in (0, 1)$, if we set

$$\lambda \geq 2\sigma \max_j \|X_{*j}\| (\sqrt{r} + \sqrt{2\log(p/\eta)}),$$

then (32) holds with probability at least $1 - \eta$.

Proof of Theorem 5. We may rewrite the minimization problem in a vectorized version as follows

$$\min_{B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}} \|\mathrm{vec}(W) - (I_r \otimes X)\mathrm{vec}(B)\|_2^2/2 + \lambda \|B\|_{2,1},$$

where vec is usual vectorization operator and $\otimes$ is the Kronecker product as defined in (Muirhead, 1982, Section 2.2). In this case, the rows of B form natural groups which are all of size r and $\mathrm{vec}(B)$ satisfies the (s, rs) strong group-sparsity as defined in Huang and Zhang (2010).

We are to prove the desired result by invoking Lemma D.4 of Huang and Zhang (2010). To this end, we first verify that the two conditions of the lemma is satisfied. Note that the penalty level in Huang and Zhang (2010) corresponds to $2\lambda/(nr)$ in our notion, X_{G_j} corresponds to X_{*j}, and the sparse eigenvalues $\rho_+(G_j)$ and $\rho_\pm(rs)$ are identified as

$$\rho_+(G_j) = \|X_{*j}\|^2/(nr), \quad \rho_\pm(rs) = \kappa_\pm^2(s)/(nr).$$

Let $\ell = s_* - s - 1$ and $\lambda_-^2 = \min\{k\lambda^2 : kr \geq \ell r + 1, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} = (\ell + 1)\lambda^2$. The conditions of Huang and Zhang (2010, Lemma D.4) can be rewritten in our notation as

$$2\|X'_{*j}(W - XB)\|_F \leq \lambda \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_+^2(s_*, s_* - s)}{\kappa_-^2(s_*)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\ell + 1}{s}}, \tag{33}$$

where $\widetilde{\kappa}_+^2(s_*, s_* - s) = \sqrt{(\kappa_+^2(s_*) - \kappa_-^2(2s_* - s))(\kappa_+^2(s_* - s) - \kappa_-^2(2s_* - s))}$.

Since by Definition 1, $\kappa_-^2(s) \leq \kappa_-^2(t) \leq \kappa_+^2(t) \leq \kappa_+^2(s)$, $\forall t \leq s$, we obtain

$$\widetilde{\kappa}_+^2(s_*, s_* - s) \leq \kappa_+^2(s_*) - \kappa_-^2(2s_*).$$

Thus, the conditions in (33) are satisfied under the assumption of Theorem 5. Then the conclusion of Huang and Zhang (2010, Lemma D.4) leads to

$$\|\widehat{B} - B\|_F \leq \frac{3}{\kappa_-^2(s_*)}(1 + 1.5\sqrt{s/(\ell + 1)})\sqrt{s}\lambda \leq \frac{3(1 + (4c_*)^{-1})}{\kappa_-^2(s_*)}\sqrt{s}\lambda.$$

This completes the proof of part (i).

Turning to part (ii), we need to upper bound $2\|X'_{*j}(W - XB)\|_F$. Since $X'_{*j}(W - XB)$ is a vector of length r with iid $N(0, \sigma^2\|X_{*j}\|^2)$ entries, it follows from Laurent and Massart (2000, Eq.(4.3)) that with probability $1 - \eta/p$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|X'_{*j}(W - XB)\|_F^2 &\leq \sigma^2\|X_{*j}\|^2(r + 2\sqrt{r\log(p/\eta)} + 2\log(p/\eta)) \\ &\leq \sigma^2\|X_{*j}\|^2(\sqrt{r} + \sqrt{2\log(p/\eta)})^2.\end{aligned}$$

With probability at least $1 - \eta$, we have $2\|X'_{*j}(W - XB)\|_F \leq \lambda$ for all j and thus (32) holds. □

References

Bakin, S. (1999). *Adaptive regression and model selection in data mining problems*. Ph. D. thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.

Birgé, L. (1983). Approximation dans les espaces métriques et théorie de l'estimation. *Z. für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Geb. 65*(2), 181–237.

Bunea, F., Lederer, J., and She, Y. (2013). The group square-root lasso: Theoretical properties and fast algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.0261*.

Bunea, F., She, Y. and Wegkamp, M. (2011). Optimal selection of reduced rank estimators of high-dimensional matrices. *The Annals of Statistics 39*(2), 1282–1309.

Bunea, F., She, Y. and Wegkamp, M. (2012). Joint variable and rank selection for parsimonious estimation of high dimensional matrices. *The Annals of Statistics 40*(5), 2359–2763.

Candes, E. and Tao, T. (2007). The Dantzig selector: statistical estimation when p is much larger than n. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2313–2351.

Chen, K., Chan, K. S. and Stenseth, N. R. (2012). Sparse reduced-rank regression for simultaneous dimension reduction and variable selection in multivariate regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology) 74*(2), 203–221.

Chen, L. and Huang, J. (2012). Sparse reduced-rank regression for simultaneous dimension reduction and variable selection in multivariate regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 107*(500), 1533–1545.

Chen, S. S., Donoho, D. L. and Saunders, M. A. (1998). Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit. *SIAM journal on scientific computing 20*(1), 33–61.

Chin, K., DeVries, S., Fridlyand, J., Spellman, P. T., Roydasgupta, R. , Kuo, W.-L., Lapuk, A., Neve, R. M., Qian, Z., Ryder, T., et al. (2006). Genomic and transcriptional aberrations linked to breast cancer pathophysiologies. *Cancer Cell 10*(6), 529–541.

Davidson, K. and Szarek, S. (2001). *Handbook on the Geometry of Banach Spaces*, Volume 1, Chapter Local operator theory, random matrices and Banach spaces, pp. 317–366. Elsevier Science.

Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 96*, 1348–1360.

Huang, J., Breheny, P., and Ma, S. (2012). A selective review of group selection in high-dimensional models. *Statistical Science 27*(4), 481–499.

Huang, J. and Zhang, T. (2010). The benefit of group sparsity. *The Annals of Statistics 38*(4), 1978–2004.

Ibragimov, I. and Has'minskii, R. (1981). *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer.

Izenman, A. (1975). Reduced-rank regression for the multivariate linear model. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis 5*(2), 248–264.

Koltchinskii, V., Lounici, K., and Tsybakov, A. (2011). Nuclear-norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion. *The Annals of Statistics 39*(5), 2302–2329.

Laurent, B. and Massart, P. (2000). Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *The annals of Statistics 28*(5), 1302–1338.

Lounici, K., Pontil, M., van de Geer, S., and Tsybakov, A. B. (2011). Oracle inequalities and optimal inference under group sparsity. *The Annals of Statistics 39*(4), 2164–2204.

Ma, Z. and Wu, Y. (2013). Volume ratio, sparsity, and minimaxity under unitarily invariant norms. *Preprint arXiv:1306.3609*.

Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2010). Stability selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology) 72*(4), 417–473.

Muirhead, R. (1982). *Aspects of Multivariate Statistical Theory*. John Wiley and Sons.

Reinsel, G. and Velu, R. (1998). *Multivariate reduced-rank regression: Theory and applications*. New York: Springer.

Rigollet, P. and Tsybakov, A. (2011). Exponential Screening and optimal rates of sparse estimation. *The Annals of Statistics 39*(2), 731–771.

Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 267–288.

Tsybakov, A. (2009). *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Verlag.

Vounou, M., Janousova, E., Wolz, R., Stein, J., Thompson, P., Rueckert, D., and Montana, G. (2012). Sparse reduced-rank regression detects genetic associations with voxel-wise longitudinal phenotypes in alzheimer's disease. *Neuroimage 60*(1), 700–716.

Vounou, M., Nichols, T., and Montana, G. (2010). Discovering genetic associations with high-dimensional neuroimaging phenotypes: a sparse reduced-rank regression approach. *Neuroimage 53*(3), 1147–1159.

Wedin, P.-A. (1972). Perturbation bounds in connection with singular value decomposition. *BIT 12*, 99–111.

Witten, D., Tibshirani, R., Gross, S., and Narasimhan, B. (2013). *PMA: Penalized Multivariate Analysis*. R package version 1.0.9.

Witten, D. M., Tibshirani, R., and Hastie, T. (2009). A penalized matrix decomposition, with applications to sparse principal components and canonical correlation analysis. *Biostatistics 10*, 515–534.

Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. (2006). Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology) 68*(1), 49–67.

Zhang, C. (2010a). Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of Statistics 38*(2), 894–942.

Zhang, C. and Huang, J. (2008). The sparsity and bias of the lasso selection in high-dimensional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics 36*(4), 1567–1594.

Zhang, T. (2010b). Analysis of multi-stage convex relaxation for sparse regularization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research 11*, 1081–1107.